

CMER
November 20, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees:

Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Dominquez, Larry	DNR, Small Landowner Office
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental
Heide, Pete	FPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Keller, Steve	NOAA Fisheries
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental (CMER co-chair)
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	AMPA, DNR
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Steve	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Prater, Brian	Campbell Group
Price, Dave	WDFW
Robinson, Tom	WSAOC
Roorbach, Ash	NWIFC
Rowton, Heather	WSPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Decisions and Tasks

Decisions and Tasks	Minutes Section
SRC Questions – Dennis McDonald and Allen Pleus will work to draft a proposal for how generate questions for SRC review	SRC
DFC Report – CMER recommends that questions proceed to SRC for review as	DFC Report

proposed.	
ISAG – Pilot Validation Study Request for \$15,000 to analyze 17 additional sub-basins was approved pending review.	SAG Requests
The budget spreadsheet was forwarded to CMER participants for review prior to the December meeting.	Budget

Minutes: Minutes for the October CMER meeting will be approved in December rather than today. Please note that the minutes from the meeting did contain one substantive error that has now been corrected. Specifically, the Policy Committee did not request that CMER send whitepapers with study results; the minutes had this backwards.

A proposal to move regular monthly CMER meetings to another day of the month will be brought forward in December.

SRC Update: The watertyping model has been forwarded to the SRC for review. McNaughton worked with the ISAG co-chairs to frame the questions and send the report to SRC; however, there are some process questions that will need to be addressed today by CMER.

Clarification regarding the role of the SRC was offered. The SRC is to review the product, not resolve differences of opinion among SAG members. Martin added that the SRC is to provide scientific feedback only. Questions that accompany products for SRC review should be technical in nature, not political or implementation related.

McDonald suggested that as questions are developed for SRC review, those questions be developed in a group setting and agreed upon rather than circulated through e-mail and never formalized. Guidance on the process and expectations would be helpful.

A proposed process for generating questions for SRC review is below. Allen Pleus and Dennis McDonald will work together to refine to this process and will bring a formal proposal forward in December.

1. SAG – gather and develop questions
2. SAG – Bring questions forward to CMER for review. If there are disagreements on the questions, sharpen those and bring to CMER for review and resolution of any disputes.
3. SAG – incorporate any revisions agreed to by CMER, then forward questions to AMPA who will review and send to SRC with the report for review.

Two items to consider when sending a report

- 1) sometimes there is a technical questions and the SAG scientists are disagreeing on the answer

- 2) When we hand them the report, are we giving them enough context for them to read and review the report in a meaningful way.
-

Last Fish Validation: This report is being withdrawn for consideration for SRC review at this time and will be brought to the December meeting for further discussion by CMER.

DFC Report: Following the October CMER meeting, RSAG continued efforts to develop comments and questions for SRC to consider that would help them understand the context of the report and direct their attention to specific questions about which there is scientific uncertainty or technical limitations to a given methodology that should be reviewed. RSAG was unable to fully resolve a difference of opinion on one important question provided by Dr. Bruce Lippke, of the University of Washington. The disagreement focuses on what characteristics of riparian stands the DFC concept, and hence a study directed at evaluating DFC basal area targets was meant to address. As RSAG understands it, Dr. Lippke believes that the sample pool should have consisted of unmanaged riparian stands regardless of their current species composition or age; that is, he understood the DFC concept and hence the appropriate sample population for this study to be any unmanaged stand ranging from very old to very young, and from pure conifer to pure hardwood. RSAG focused the study to address the rule and selected only stands that were likely to meet DFC basal area targets, which were either conifer-dominated or mixed species stands, but not hardwood dominated stands. Stands aged at or near 140-yr of age were selected because the DFC targets are applied to 140-yr old stands. CMER participants agreed that this fundamental question of defining the objective of the research and selecting stands accordingly that boils down to essentially, “did we do the right study?” rather than, “given our goals and objectives, is our study sound and our results supported by the data collected and analyses made”, was for policy to decide.

CMER Consensus: CMER agrees that the question Lippke is raising is a policy question and recommends that the questions go forward without that question included.

Last Fish Model: Questions surrounding this study will be resolved at the December CMER meeting. The questions will be forwarded to CMER at least two weeks before the next CMER meeting to ensure that they can be discussed and resolved in December. Then, if they need to be forwarded to the SRC for review, they will be forwarded at that time.

Compliance Monitoring Update: Marcus Johns updated CMER that he is taking the lead on compliance monitoring protocol development. Johns has done background research on other efforts in other states and has included information from the early TFW monitoring efforts. An internal DNR group will meet in early December. At this time,

efforts are envisioned to be focused statewide and only on FFR lands. Only FPAs filed since FFR rules went into effect will be used for compliance monitoring. RMZs, roads and fish passage are the first issues proposed to receive focus. A sample size will be defined. A written schedule is not available at this time.

SAG Issues

ISAG – the pilot validation study that CMER sponsored last summer has been moving forward. The contractor notified ISAG, earlier this year that he underspent his data collection money. Therefore, ISAG encouraged him to collect more data, which he did. He reviewed 17 sub-basins rather than the eight that were originally anticipated for sampling. ISAG is now requesting an additional \$15,000 for this contractor to incorporate the additional data into the study.

CMER stressed that this is poor contract management and should not happen again. In the future, if there is a change in scope, then a contract modification will be required. This procedure will be clarified in a memorandum, as will the process for bringing forward SAG requests.

CMER Consensus: CMER recommended that the \$15,000 be approved, pending a review of the legality of the request.

Budget: Based on input from the budget and program prioritization workshops, the co-chairs and Geoff prepared a proposed CMER budget that delineates the bare essential projects from other desired projects.

Comments and questions:

- There are some items on the spreadsheet that do not have dollar amounts yet because the study designs are not completed.
- Comments regarding accuracy of the budget should be directed to McNaughton.

The budget is divided into three primary categories: essential (E) projects, finish (F) projects, and Policy (P) option projects. Essential projects are those projects which, based on past prioritization and the recent CMER workshop, are viewed as essential to the effectiveness of the adaptive management program. Projects with an F designation are those projects which are not considered essential, but are important and should be completed. Policy option projects are those projects which may or may not be essential pending future policy decisions and potential needs for adaptive management. The task for CMER is to go down the list and agree as a CMER body, on which projects are E's and which ones are not. Also, the SAGs need to provide final cost estimates for their projects, especially for the projects that currently do not have a cost estimate. At the December meeting, we will review the final budget proposals from each SAG and will adjust the budget as-needed to reach a funding goal of approximately \$3.5 million.

The budget sheet and associated prioritization documents will be distributed to all CMER participants for review and evaluation prior to the December meeting.
